

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-6 were pending in this application. In the Final Office Action dated October 21, 2005, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In response, Applicants have canceled claims 3-6 and, therefore, request that the rejections of claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to place it in better form for allowance. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found, for example, in Fig. 1 and at page 8, paragraph 44 of Applicants' specification. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 overcomes the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 3,696,472 (hereinafter "*Perina*").

More specifically, amended claim 1 recites that "in the flange at a shoulder opening side, a down-grade slope, which is inclined downward toward the bottom plate at the shoulder opening side, and in each side wall at the shoulder opening side, a down-grade slope, which is continuous to the down-grade slop in the flange and is inclined downward toward the bottom plate at the shoulder opening side." As such, amended claim 1 specifically requires that the down-grade slopes be provided in each of the flanges and each of the side walls at the shoulder opening side, where the down-

grade slopes are inclined downward toward the bottom plate at the shoulder opening side.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner contends that *Perina* discloses the claimed down-grade slope because it shows “a slanted front end wall that forms the end surface of the sidewalls 40 and the flanges 21 and 22.” Office Action, page 4. However, Applicants submit that the slanted front end wall referred to by the Examiner is provided on a side surface of a slidable closure member 40 in a length direction. Indeed, the end surface of the sidewalls 40, i.e., the end portion 41 and the end portion opposite to end portion 41, are shown as straight edges without slopes or curvatures. See *Perina*'s Fig. 2. Thus, *Perina* at least fails to show or suggest “in the flange at a shoulder opening side, a down-grade slope, which is inclined downward toward the bottom plate at the shoulder opening side, and in each side wall at the shoulder opening side, a down-grade slope, which is continuous to the down-grade slop in the flange and is inclined downward toward the bottom plate at the shoulder opening side.” Therefore, at least because *Perina* fails to show or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over *Perina* should be withdrawn.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 17, 2006

By: 
Cathy C. Ding
Reg. No. 52,820